

Exhibit G

From: [Scott, Jessica](#)
To: [Jeremy Abay](#); [Shannon Liss-Riordan \(sliss@llrlaw.com\)](#)
Cc: [Sarah Schalman-Bergen](#); [Harold Lichten \(hlichten@llrlaw.com\)](#); [Matthew Carrieri](#); [McHugh, Joe](#); [Kennedy, Shanicka](#); [Whitt, Celyn](#); [Schaller, David](#)
Subject: RE: Questions re Abner, Brannon, and Alleyne cases
Date: Tuesday, October 8, 2024 7:43:16 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Counsel,

Following up on the below yet again. We'd appreciate a response on this.

Jessica

Jessica G. Scott (she/her/hers)
Partner, Diversity & Inclusion Co-Chair
Wheeler Trigg O'Donnell LLP

From: Scott, Jessica <scott@wtotrial.com>
Sent: Friday, September 20, 2024 3:08 PM
To: [Jeremy Abay <jabay@llrlaw.com>](#); [Shannon Liss-Riordan \(sliss@llrlaw.com\) <sliss@llrlaw.com>](#)
Cc: [Sarah Schalman-Bergen <ssb@llrlaw.com>](#); [Harold Lichten \(hlichten@llrlaw.com\) <hlichten@llrlaw.com>](#); [Matthew Carrieri <mcarrieri@llrlaw.com>](#); [McHugh, Joe <joseph.mchugh@fedex.com>](#); [Kennedy, Shanicka <shanicka.kennedy@fedex.com>](#); [Whitt, Celyn <Whitt@wtotrial.com>](#); [Schaller, David <schaller@wtotrial.com>](#)
Subject: RE: Questions re Abner, Brannon, and Alleyne cases

Following up on the below.

Thank you,
Jessica

Jessica G. Scott (she/her/hers)
Partner, Diversity & Inclusion Co-Chair
Wheeler Trigg O'Donnell LLP

From: Scott, Jessica <scott@wtotrial.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 3, 2024 3:54 PM
To: [Jeremy Abay <jabay@llrlaw.com>](#); [Shannon Liss-Riordan \(sliss@llrlaw.com\) <sliss@llrlaw.com>](#)

Cc: Sarah Schalman-Bergen <ssb@llrlaw.com>; Harold Lichten (hlichten@llrlaw.com) <hlichten@llrlaw.com>; Matthew Carrieri <mcarrieri@llrlaw.com>; McHugh, Joe <joseph.mchugh@fedex.com>; Kennedy, Shanicka <shanicka.kennedy@fedex.com>; Whitt, Celyn <Whitt@wtotrial.com>; Schaller, David <schaller@wtotrial.com>

Subject: Questions re Abner, Brannon, and Alleyne cases

Shannon and Jeremy,

I wanted to confirm a few things based on statements Plaintiffs' counsel have previously made and trying to put pieces together to work from a base understanding. Can you please confirm the following:

(1) That the intent is that each Plaintiff listed in these three cases was an opt-in in either *Claiborne* (for *Abner* and *Brannon*) or *Roy* (*Alleyne*)? Meaning that we should not expect to see “brand new” Plaintiffs we have not seen before as opt-ins in those case?

(2) That *Brannon* is intended to contain former *Claiborne* opt-ins that were participants in opt-in discovery in some way (even if that way was simply Plaintiffs obtaining scanner data for them – meaning they may not have completed a discovery questionnaire)?

(3) That *Alleyne* is intended to contain former *Roy* opt-ins that did not participate in discovery?

(4) That *Abner* is intended to contain former *Claiborne* opt-ins that did not participate in discovery?

Thank you,
Jessica

Jessica G. Scott (she/her/hers)

Partner, Diversity & Inclusion Co-Chair

P 303.244.1846 | **F** 303.244.1879

370 17th Street, Suite 4500, Denver CO 80202-5647

scott@wtotrial.com | wtotrial.com | [vCard](#)

